

WHAT IS THE HRIDAYADARPAṆA ?

In the January issue of the JRAS. for 1908 is an article on Mahimabhaṭṭa's *Vyaktiviveka* from the pen of Mr. Narsimhiengar. In that article there is a list of works and authors quoted by Mahimabhaṭṭa, wherein Mr. Narsimhiengar mentions the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa* as a commentary by Bhaṭṭanāyaka on Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. I agree with Mr. Narsimhiengar in attributing the work to Bhaṭṭanāyaka for the following reasons :—

Firstly, Ruyyaka, in his *Alaṅkārasarvasva* (p. 9, Kāvya-mālā ed.), mentions the views of Bhaṭṭanāyaka. The same Bhaṭṭanāyaka is referred to as Hṛidayadarpaṇakāra by Jayaratha, Ruyyaka's commentator (id., p.12, l. 26), who says that Hṛidayadarpaṇakāra came after Dhvanikāra in point of age.

Secondly, Abhinavagupta quotes in the *Dhvanyāloka-lochana* (p. 27, Kāvya-mālā ed., ll. 18–19)

शब्दप्राधान्यमाश्रित्य तत्र शास्त्रं पृथग्विदुः ।
अर्थप्राधान्यमाश्रित्य वदन्त्याख्यानमेतयोः ॥
द्वयोर्गुणत्वे व्यापारप्राधान्ये काव्यधीर्भवेत् ।

as of Bhaṭṭanāyaka. The same reference (with some variation of reading) is made to the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa* by Hemachandra in his *Kāvyaṇuṣāṇa* (pp. 3–4, Kāvya-mālā ed.).

Now what is the nature of the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa* ?

Abhinavagupta, while commenting on

कौञ्चद्वन्द्ववियोगोत्थः शोकः स्तोकत्वमागतः ।

(*Dhvanikārikā*, i, 5), says that no mere grief, but the feeling due to a sympathetic imagination of the situation, gets developed into a Rasa. To confirm his position he cites Bhaṭṭanāyaka's *Hṛidayadarpaṇa* thus: एतदेवोक्तं हृदयदर्पणे “यावत्पूर्णा न चैतेन तावन्नैवैवम्”. So long as he is not full of that (feeling due to the imaginative identification

with the situation—which is gathered from the context) there is not (any Rasa).

In the next passage, **शब्दप्राधान्यमाश्रित्य**, etc., from the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa*, which, like the preceding, is in verse, Bhaṭṭanāyaka gives the distinguishing features of **शास्त्र** (scripture), **इतिहास** (narration or story), and **काव्य** (poetry). These are accepted by all later rhetoricians, such as Abhinavagupta and Mammāṭa. He says that in scriptural passages we attach importance to words (i.e. literal sense), in a story to (metaphorical) sense, but in poetry both of these are subordinate, and Vyāpāra (the function 'charvaṇā', or delectation, as suggested by Abhinavagupta) becomes the prominent element.

On p. 28 (ll. 7–8) of the *Dhvanyālokalochana* we find a prose passage from the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa* **सर्वत्र तर्हि काव्यव्यवहारः स्यात्**। From the context we know this means that, since every saying can ultimately yield some suggested sense, every saying would have to be called poetry, if suggested sense is to be the soul of poetry.

The last passage is on p. 63 (ll. 9–10) in prose: **हृहा हेति संरक्षार्थोऽयं चमत्कारः** This is clearly a criticism of Ānandavardhana's view of the verse **स्निग्धश्चामलकान्ति**, etc. (p. 61, ll. 4 sqq.), that the word Rāma, connoting various attributes, conduces to the beauty of the verse and makes it an instance of Avivakṣitavāchya-Dhvani. Bhaṭṭanāyaka denies this, and says that the beauty of the verse is due to the intense feeling conveyed by the words **हृहा हा**, which eventually gives rise to Vipralambhaçṛiṅgāra.

From the above it appears that the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa* is not likely to be a commentary on Bharata's *Nāṭyaçāstra*, but is probably a work in prose and verse criticizing the idea of Dhvani as found in the *Dhvanyāloka*, and establishing a new doctrine about poetry, with its three functions Abhidhā, Bhāvanā, and Charvaṇā (as gathered from Bhaṭṭanāyaka's views in *Dhvanyālokalochana*). That

this work is probably devoted to this purpose is confirmed by Paṇḍit Gaṇapatiçāstrin's letter to me. Paṇḍit Gaṇapatiçāstrin, formerly Principal of the Maharāja's Sanskrit College, Trivandrum, and now Curator, Department of Publication of Sanskrit Works there, promises to make this point clear in his Introduction to his edition of Mahimabhaṭṭa's *Vyaktiviveka*.

About the age of the *Hṛidayadarpaṇa*, we may say that it came after Anandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* and before Abhinavagupta's *Dhvanyālokalochana*.

VENKATESH VĀMAN SOVANĪ.

NOTES ON THE BĀBAR-NĀMA

I. DR. HEINRICH JULIUS KLAPROTH'S PART TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK

II. ON THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE WORD TĀSHKAND

I. DR. KLAPROTH'S TRANSLATION

In 1810 Dr. H. J. Klaproth published in St. Petersburg a volume entitled *Archiv für Asiatische Litteratur* which was meant to be the first of a series, but has had no successor. Amongst its contents is an article on the *Bābar-nāma*, consisting of a brief account of Bābar himself, a reference and part translation of certain extra *Bābar-nāma* matter he had found on the fly-leaves of his archetype, and a translation of Bābar's description of Farghāna. The extra matter he found in his archetype is what Dr. Kehr, having found in his, translated into Latin and entered on the first pages of the volume containing his Latin text. Klaproth does not mention from what MS. he translated, but there is strong general probability that he used Kehr's own copy which was in St. Petersburg, and this probability is strengthened by the fact that both men, and they only of writers yet known in Bābar literature, reproduce the fly-leaf items.